REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 17 and 18 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,611 to Watanabe ("Watanabe").

Claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,087 B1 to Ikeda ("Ikeda").

Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,508 B1 to Hata ("Hata").

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,522,360 B1 to Miyawaki, et al. ("Miyawaki").

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of FIG. 4 of the specification. FIG. 4 teaches an apparatus in which a blur-controlled image generated by the synthesizer is put through a plurality of cascaded processes other than blur control, the degree of each process other than blur control is changed by a changer in accordance with the amount of blur. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Watanabe, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 1 and 9 are currently amended to include the following language:

> "[A]n image processor for sequentially performing a plurality of processes other than blur control on the blur-controlled image generated by the synthesizer; and
>
> a changer for changing a degree of the processes other than blur control in accordance with the amount of blur."

Watanabe teaches a high-frequency emphasis circuit whose degree is controlled in accordance with the amount of blur. However, Watanabe does not teach the use of blur amount to control the degree of any other type of process, nor does Watanabe suggest sequentially performing a plurality of processes other than blur control in which the degrees of the processes are changed in accordance with the amount of blur. The admitted prior art does not teach the use of blur control to vary the degree of any processes other than blur control.

Because the combination of Watanabe and the admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claims 1 and 9, the combination of Watanabe and the prior art cannot render claims 1 and 9 obvious. Claims 4 and 5 and 12 and 13 depend on claims 1 and 9 respectively. As the combination of Watanabe and the admitted prior art fail to render claims 1 and 9 obvious, the combination of Watanabe and the prior art fail to render claims 4-5 and 12-13 obvious for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Watanabe, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of Ikeda, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

As shown above, Watanabe teaches a high-frequency emphasis circuit whose degree is controlled in accordance with the amount of blur. However, Watanabe does not teach the use of blur amount to control the degree of any other type of process, nor does Watanabe suggest sequentially performing a plurality of processes other than blur control in which the degrees of the processes are changed in accordance with the amount of blur. The admitted prior art does not teach the use of blur control to vary the degree of any processes other than blur control. Ikeda suggests that chrominance compression may be increased through blurring of an image with narrow bandwidth (col. 13, lines 41-43). However, Ikeda does not teach the use of blur amount to control the degree of any type of process, nor does Ikeda suggest sequentially performing a plurality of processes other than blur control in accordance with the amount of blur. Moreover, Ikeda does not disclose or suggest any benefit derived from making the degree of chrominance compression a function of the amount of blur.

Because the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Ikeda does not disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claims 1 and 9, the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Ikeda cannot render claims 1 and 9 obvious. Claims 2 and 3 and 10 and 11 depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively. As the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Ikeda fails to render claims 1 and 9 obvious, the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Ikeda fails to render claims 2-3 and 10-11 obvious for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of Ikeda, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of Hata, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

As shown above, Watanabe teaches a high-frequency emphasis circuit whose degree is controlled in accordance with the amount of blur. However, Watanabe does not teach the use of blur amount to control the degree of any other type of process, nor does Watanabe suggest sequentially performing a plurality of processes other than blur control in which the degrees of the processes are changed in accordance with the amount of blur. The admitted prior art does not teach the use of blur control to vary the degree of any processes other than blur control.

Hata teaches an application in which a CPU increases the gain of a variable gain control (VG) amplifier during a blur-avoiding mode (col. 9, lines 61-67; col. 10, lines 1-5). However, this process is directed towards prevention of blurring during high-speed photography under low-light conditions, which is impossible with traditional film-cameras (col. 10, lines 5-12). This is done by keeping the shutter speed slow enough to prevent blurring and compensating for the decreased exposure by amplifying the image with the VG amplifier (col. 9, lines 61-67; col. 10, lines 1-5). The claimed apparatus can be distinguished from Hata, because it accepts a blurred image and emphasizes high-frequency components to make contour lines clear, *see* paragraph [0054]. Furthermore, Hata does not teach the use of blur amount to control the degree of any type of process, nor does Hata suggest sequentially performing a plurality of processes other than blur control in accordance with the amount of blur. Moreover, Hata does not disclose any benefit derived from making the degree of a VG amplifier a function of the amount of blur.

Applicants therefore respectively disagree with Examiner that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a changer that changes the amplification ratio such that the amplification increases as the amount of blur increases.

Because the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Hata does not disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claims 1 and 9, the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Hata cannot render claims 1 and 9 obvious. Claims 6 and 7 and 14 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively. As the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Hata fails to render claims 1 and 9 obvious, the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Hata fails to render claims 6-7 and 14-15 obvious for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of Hata, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of Miyawaki, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

As shown above, Watanabe teaches a high-frequency emphasis circuit whose degree is controlled in accordance with the amount of blur. However, Watanabe does not teach the use of blur amount to control the degree of any other type of process, nor does Watanabe suggest sequentially performing a plurality of processes other than blur control in which the degrees of the processes are changed in accordance with the amount of blur. The admitted prior art does not teach the use of blur control to vary the degree of any processes other than blur control.

Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner that Miyawaki teaches an application in which gamma correction is changed with the amount of blur. Rather

Miyawaki discloses a process in which a signal is supplied to a gamma correction and AGC circuit, the output of which is used as a focus evaluation value (col. 1, lines 49-51). There is no suggestion in Miyawaki however that the gamma correction and AGC circuit accepts any input signal that adjusts the degree of gamma correction of the resultant image data. Moreover, Miyawaki does not disclose any benefit derived from making the degree of gamma correction a function of the amount of blur.

Because the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claims 1 and 9, the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Miyawaki cannot render claims 1 and 9 obvious. Claims 8 and 16 depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively. As the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Miyawaki fails to render claims 1 and 9 obvious, the combination of Watanabe, the admitted prior art and Miyawaki fails to render claims 8 and 16 obvious for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art, Watanabe, and in further view of Miyawaki, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

This Response does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims beyond the number of claims originally paid for. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of

Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed. Any fee required for such a Petition for Extension of Time or any other fee required by this response, including any fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Mark A. Dodd

Mark A. Dodd
Registration No. 45,729
Attorney for Applicants

MAD/llb:jkk
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3481
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
November 7, 2005

DA1 329534v.5